

## **REMARKS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-24 were previously [and are currently] pending and under consideration.

Claims 25-28 are added herein.

Therefore, claims 1-28 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-24 are rejected.

Claims 1-24 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 2, 8, 10, 16, 18 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. The Examiner alleged that the claim recitation "insufficient" was not clear. Although Applicant submits that in view of the specification the term is clear and definite, the term has been replaced with "required"; insufficient slots being slots that are not filled that are required for the aim of the dialogue. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102**

In the Office Action, at pages 2-10, claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Kuo. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

CLAIMS 1, 9, AND 17

Amended claims 1, 9, and 17 recite "determining whether said one dialogue is completed based on whether all of said information items required to achieve said aim of said one dialogue have been stored into all of said predetermined number of slots". In other words, the predetermined number of slots is used to determine whether the dialogue is completed. See at least page 9, lines 16-29 of the present specification.

In contrast, the user profile and databases in Kuo are not directly used to determine whether the dialogue is completed. Furthermore, because the "predetermined number" is not defined in Kuo, it is not possible for Kuo to determine whether all the information items required to achieve the aim of the dialogue have been acquired (e.g. by checking whether the user profile and database are all filled).

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2, 10, AND 18 INCONSISTENT WITH REJECTION OF CLAIM 1

In claim 2, the slots and the knowledge base are two different elements of the claims. By using the information stored in the slots and the information stored in the knowledge base, any slot is filled. Kuo does not discuss or suggest this feature.

The rejection of claim 2 proposes that the "knowledge base" recited in claim 2 corresponds to the "user profile" in Kuo. The rejection of claim 1 stated that Kuo's user profile corresponds to the slots of claim 1. According to the rejection's argument, Kuo's user profile is used by the user profile to fill the user profile. This process is not disclosed in Kuo and is not even possible; how can a user profile fill itself?

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 5, 13, AND 21

Amended claims 5, 13, and 21 recite "determining whether information stored in said knowledge base is necessary to be updated if all said information items required to achieve said aim of said one dialogue with said certain user are stored in all of said predetermined number of slots".

The rejection cited column 3, lines 10-20 of Kuo as discussing determining whether information in the knowledge base is necessary to update if the information items required to achieve the aim of the dialog are stored in all of the slots. However, Kuo does not discuss that "all said information items required to achieve said aim of said one dialogue with said certain user are stored in all of said predetermined number of slots".

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103**

In the Office Action, at pages 11-15, claims 4, 12 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kuo in view of Fukumochi and further in view of Miike. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

#### **PRIMA FACIE CASE OF OBVIOUSNESS NOT ESTABLISHED: IMPROPER MOTIVE TO COMBINE**

The obviousness rejection proposed combining Kuo with Fukumochi. The rejection states that the combination would allow Kuo to determine syntax of a sentence and to correlate the sources of words (page 12, lines 1-3). The motive is cited as coming from column 5, lines 38 and 39 of Fukumochi. This portion states that Fukumochi is designed to improve grammatical rules where limited or incomplete rules are available. Nothing in Kuo suggests that it has limited or incomplete grammatical rules, or that its grammatical rules need improvement. The modification only increases the complexity of Kuo without addressing any specific need for improvement in Kuo.

The obviousness rejection also proposed modifying Kuo-Fukumochi with Miike. This rejection did not provide a motive in the prior art. A motive to combine prior art references (1) must come from the prior art, (2) must be specific, and (3) must show why one skilled in the art would desire to make the proposed modification. The motive provided in the rejection is that "it would have been obvious ... in order to reduce processing time and the effort required to retrieve or store data from/to system [sic] database". The motive fails to meet all three requirements. The motive is provided without any reference to prior art, the motive is too general (the

implication is that all inventions that reduce processing time etc. are obvious), and the motive does not show why one skilled in the art would desire to use an extraction rule with Kuo; what information needs to be extracted in Kuo and why?

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 6 recites "determining said information storage state of said slots and for acquiring and outputting response information for said certain user in correspondence with said information storage state of said slots from said response information storage device". This feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

### **NEW CLAIMS**

New claims 25-28 have been added to clarify aspects of the present invention in which "at least one of the extracted fields [from a response] was supplemental information volunteered from the user without having been previously specifically prompted for by a prompt prepared or selected to be presented to the user" (claim 25), where the prompts can be in a dynamic order (claim 26), where pronouns may be used to refer to slots (claim 27), and where the dialog objective is determined to be met when all of the slot fields are filled (claim 28). These claims are supported at least by page 5 of the specification.

**CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 19 April 2004

By: James T. Strom  
James T. Strom  
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501